```
1
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                   MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
 2
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                      ) Greensboro, North Carolina
                                        September 3, 2014
 3
                                        10:57 a.m.
       vs.
 4
   BRIAN DAVID HILL,
 5
                                        Case No. 1:13CR435-1
       Defendant.
 6
 7
                      TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
 8
              BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. OSTEEN, JR.
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
 9
   APPEARANCES:
10
   For the Government:
                         TIMOTHY NICK MATKINS, AUSA
                         Office of the U.S. Attorney
11
                         PO BOX 1858
12
                         Greensboro, North Carolina 27402
13
   For the Defendant:
                         ERIC D. PLACKE, AFPD
                         Office of the Federal Public Defender
14
                         301 N. Elm Street, Suite 410
                         Greensboro, North Carolina 27401
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
   Court Reporter:
                       Joseph B. Armstrong, RMR, FCRR
22
                       324 W. Market, Room 101
                       Greensboro, NC 27401
23
              Proceedings reported by stenotype reporter.
24
         Transcript produced by Computer-Aided Transcription.
25
```

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (At 10:57 a.m., proceedings commenced.) 3 (Defendant present.) 4 MR. MATKINS: Your Honor, the final matter the Government will call this morning is United States versus Brian 5 6 David Hill, 1:13CR435-1. Mr. Hill is represented by Attorney 7 Eric Placke, and the matter is before the Court for a motion. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Hill, you may have a seat. I'm going to talk to Mr. Placke first. 9 All right, Mr. Placke. Presently before the Court is 10 your motion to withdraw in light of the most recent letter sent 12 by Mr. Hill in this case. As I read the motion to withdraw, it 13 certainly expresses some concern about the allegations made by Mr. Hill with respect to counsel's performance, but it also seems to me to say that at this point in time the Court needs to make a decision on whether I should remain in this case; and if the Court decides that I should, then I can certainly 17 continue and see this to conclusion. Is that summary fair? 19 MR. PLACKE: That's a fair summary, Your Honor. 20 All right. Mr. Hill, I'm going to speak THE COURT: 21 with you a minute. You are represented by counsel in this case, which means you have an absolute right to remain silent. 22 Do you understand that? 23 (Nodding.) 24 THE DEFENDANT: 25 THE COURT: Mr. Hill?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And if you choose to address the Court or, as you've done, to write a letter to the Court, then I can take that information contained in that letter or that is provided in your statements, and not only me or the Government -- the Government also, we can consider that against you in this case. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So if you choose to speak, that's ultimately your choice to give up this right you have to remain silent and have your attorney speak on your behalf. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And if ultimately you do decide to say something, and you hurt your case or hurt your future, that's your responsibility. Do you understand that? It's part of the decision you make.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Um-hum.

THE COURT: Now, having warned you about that, you've written a letter making allegations against Mr. Placke with respect to some of the facts of the case and some other information you want investigated, and you sent that to the Probation Office. I've seen that letter. Knowing that I've

```
seen that letter that you wrote, is there anything else you
 2
   want to say?
 3
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             I have evidence, Your Honor, a
   four-page declaration of lawyer that I have sent to the State
   Bar and I have sent to the clerk of court, but it's not been
   filed on the docket yet, Your Honor. The papers are right over
 6
   here. And pretty much it contains all the facts that my
 7
  counsel has not done a good enough job to prove my innocence.
 9
   My counsel has basically not suppressed the evidence when there
   was evidence of such. And in these four pages, it explains
10
                That is the reason why I withdraw Mr. Placke as
11
   everything.
12
   counsel.
13
             THE COURT:
                         All right. So you and Mr. Placke are
  still talking to each other; is that correct or incorrect?
14
15
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             I did meet with him one time, but
16
  other than that, we haven't -- well --
17
             THE COURT:
                        When you have met, when the two of you
   have been together, are you able to speak with Mr. Placke?
                                                                I'm
  not talking about agree or disagree with what's going on.
19
   just asking can you talk to him? Have you been talking to him?
20
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
21
             THE COURT: And you disagree now with what Mr. Placke
22
   recommended you do with this case, is that correct?
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
24
25
             THE COURT:
                         Do you remember appearing here in court
```

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

```
and being placed under oath?
 1
 2
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 3
                         And do you remember pleading quilty?
             THE COURT:
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
 4
                         And you remember telling me that you were
 5
             THE COURT:
 6
   pleading guilty because you were, in fact, guilty?
 7
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
 8
             THE COURT: And are you now coming in here and
 9
   telling me that's not true?
10
             THE DEFENDANT: Permission to speak?
                         Just a yes or no. Are you coming in here
11
             THE COURT:
12
   and telling me that's not true?
13
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
                         So after making -- so if that is, in
14
             THE COURT:
   fact, the case, why did you tell me something false during a
15
  Rule 11 hearing?
16
17
             THE DEFENDANT: Basically, I was being rushed into
   the jury trial, and all my evidence that I had sent to the
  court never made docket, and all the suppression stuff never
19
   made it. I basically sent stuff to the Clerk of Court with the
20
  reasons why, but basically my health is bad. My A1C is 10.9.
21
  That's verifiable with the FCI Butner medical records.
22
                                                            Because
   of my health, because of the rush to jury trial, and the fact
23
  that there was no defense being sent, that Placke didn't have
25
   any kind of defense, I would have been found guilty on the spot
```

```
with up to 20 years hard time in prison. I wanted to fight on
  my own, but then my family told me over there -- you know, when
   they were sitting over there, they said take the guilty plea,
 3
   take the guilty plea, and I was like what? And I was wondering
   why do they want me to take the guilty plea. And I learned
 5
   later that basically they said I would have been found quilty
 6
   on the spot. So I had no chance to -- I had no chance to be
 7
 8
   able to submit evidence. Everything just -- you know, it's a
 9
   combination, lack of --
10
             THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. From your
   perspective, who was responsible for rushing you to a jury
11
   trial? Whose fault was that?
12
             THE DEFENDANT: N.C. Tilley, Jr.
13
                         Judge Tilley's the one?
14
             THE COURT:
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yeah.
15
16
             THE COURT:
                         That actually is pretty close to a
   correct answer. Mr. Placke can't control when cases are called
17
18
   for trial.
               The judges do. Do you understand that?
19
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
20
                         The law says you have a certain amount of
             THE COURT:
21
   time to prepare for trial under the Speedy Trial Act; but once
   that time frame is met, it's up to the judges of this district,
22
   whichever judge is assigned your case, to ultimately decide
23
   when your case gets called for trial, correct?
24
25
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
```

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

```
And what I hear you saying to me right
 1
             THE COURT:
   now is that you were interested in perhaps having a little more
 2
   time yourself, but your family told you to take the plea in the
 3
   case, correct?
 4
                             Yes, sir.
 5
             THE DEFENDANT:
 6
             THE COURT: And you listened to them?
 7
                             Yes, sir.
             THE DEFENDANT:
 8
             THE COURT:
                         So tell me this. Did your family give
 9
   you good advice or bad advice?
10
             THE DEFENDANT: Bad advice.
                         All right. But that was their advice?
11
             THE COURT:
12
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
             THE COURT:
                         Now, what is the condition you just
13
  mentioned earlier, diagnosed by Butner?
14
             THE DEFENDANT: My A1C was 10.9.
15
16
             THE COURT:
                         What's your A1C?
17
             THE DEFENDANT: A1C blood hemoglobin level is the
   level of a three-month average where the higher the level, that
  means my blood sugars have been more higher, and it can affect
19
   my ability to think clearly, and it can also cause
20
  complications such as kidney failure, eyesight failure, nerve
21
   damage. The longer my A1C stays up, my health deteriorates
22
   with a high A1C average.
23
             THE COURT: All right. Let's -- have you
24
25
   been evaluated during the course of this case?
```

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

```
1
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 2
             THE COURT: By a psychologist or a psychiatrist?
 3
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
                         And are there any other conditions that
 4
             THE COURT:
 5
   you have that you are aware of?
 6
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             I think so.
                         What is it -- what do you think?
 7
             THE COURT:
 8
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             I know I have mild autism, OCD, and,
 9
   you know, obsessive compulsive disorder, and, you know, I have
10
   a lot of anxiety, so general anxiety disorder.
             THE COURT:
                         And so is it fair -- do those -- and I'm
11
12
  not trying to embarrass you. I just need to get to the bottom
13
  of this issue that you have raised. You mentioned OCD,
  obsessive compulsive disorder. When you were originally
14
  debriefed in this case -- or when you were originally arrested
15
16
  and confronted by law enforcement, you told those officers that
17
   someone else must have downloaded those images to your
18
  computer, is that correct?
                             Yes, sir.
19
             THE DEFENDANT:
20
             THE COURT:
                         Am I remembering correctly, Mr. Placke?
21
             MR. PLACKE:
                          In part, Your Honor. There was a
  noncustodial interview conducted the day after the search
22
   warrant. It was recorded, and I've listened to it several
23
  times, played it with Mr. Hill. That was said initially.
25
   Later, the course of the interview changed, and Mr. Hill told
```

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

```
the officers that he had downloaded child pornography.
 2
                          That's right. There was an initial
             THE COURT:
   statement, and then later that changed.
 3
             Mr. Hill, ultimately, you can tell -- you can talk to
 4
   your lawyer about whatever you think might be helpful to you in
 5
 6
   defending a case. Do you understand?
 7
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
 8
             THE COURT: But at the end of the day, the question
 9
   becomes what evidence will be presented by the Government, what
   evidence will there be of what you say may have occurred.
10
  you understand that?
11
12
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT:
                         So let's say that Mr. Placke went out and
13
   got all this evidence to support what you have said about
   somebody else must have downloaded these images to my computer.
15
  You're still left with a problem, and that is you've admitted
16
17
   that you did it. Do you understand that?
18
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
19
             THE COURT: Do you understand the problems that that
20
   causes?
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
21
             THE COURT: And do you understand that those are
22
   things you need to discuss with your attorney?
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
24
25
             THE COURT:
                         Regardless of who that is?
```

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: And do you understand that your attorney may disagree with you on the wisdom of going to trial when 3 there is mixed evidence, some that might show somebody else did it, and some that might show you did it. Do you understand 5 6 that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Um-hum, yes. 8 THE COURT: And so seizing on to one piece or one 9 thought, somebody else did this, may not be in your best 10 interest. Do you understand that? I'm not saying it is or it isn't. I'm just asking if you understand that concept? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: So would you agree or disagree with me that while there may be some things that you wish could be done 14 differently that you and Mr. Placke did discuss the options 15 16 that were available to you. Do you agree with that? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: And do you agree that you and Mr. Placke tried to make the best -- or the decision that was in your best 19 20 interest at the time whether to go to trial or plead guilty? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: And at this point in time you're not 22 23 happy about that decision, is that correct? Yes, sir. 24 THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: But at the same time in talking to me 25

```
about this, do you at least a little bit understand how that
  may have been -- the decision to plead guilty may have been an
 2
   appropriate decision at the time? Do you understand that?
 3
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
 4
             THE COURT: All right. Now, in terms of Mr. Placke,
 5
 6
   you disagree with some of the -- or don't like some of the
 7
   things he did or didn't do on your behalf, correct?
 8
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 9
             THE COURT:
                         Now -- but in terms of the way this case
  has proceeded, hindsight's always 20/20, but I don't hear a lot
   of doubt in your mind that Mr. Placke was trying to do what was
11
12
   in your best interest, and at least at points you agreed with
   him; is that correct?
13
14
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             I don't think so, no.
             THE COURT:
                         You don't think so.
15
                             I mean, with all the evidence, I've
16
             THE DEFENDANT:
17
   pretty much got four witnesses to the fact that I was
18
   threatened to falsely confess, and I have two witnesses to the
  fact that the computer was being used by the police detectives
19
   before it was sent to the state crime lab.
20
             THE COURT: All right. That's the information you've
21
  got in that piece of paper? That's information developed after
22
   you had entered a guilty plea?
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yeah.
24
25
                         And who are the four witnesses?
             THE COURT:
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: My mother, Roberta Ruth Hill.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: The same person who told you to plead
 3
   quilty?
                             Yes. And the second witness is
             THE DEFENDANT:
 4
   Stella Forinash.
 5
 6
             THE COURT:
                         Who's she?
 7
             THE DEFENDANT: My grandma.
             THE COURT: Another one that was telling you to plead
 8
 9
   guilty?
             THE DEFENDANT:
10
                             Yeah.
             THE COURT: All right.
11
12
             THE DEFENDANT: The third witness is my grandpa,
   Kenneth Forinash.
13
14
             THE COURT: And he was also here the day of your
   guilty plea, wasn't he?
15
16
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yep, um-hum.
17
             THE COURT: And who else?
18
             THE DEFENDANT: Myself.
             THE COURT: All right. And you, as we discussed
19
   earlier, stood up and said under oath that you were pleading
20
  guilty because you are, in fact, guilty, correct?
21
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
22
23
             THE COURT: Mr. Hill, let me make a comment.
                                                            I don't
  know how your case is going to end up. You have some mental
24
   and emotional difficulties. You seem to be relatively bright.
25
```

```
You also seem to be very pleasant to talk to.
                                                   You are
  represented by an attorney in this district who works for the
 2
   Federal Public Defender but is a very, very fine criminal
 3
   defense lawyer. And I can understand someone in your
   condition, having entered a guilty plea, looking back and
 5
   thinking maybe I could have done something different or maybe
 6
   something would have worked out otherwise. Have you seen your
 7
 8
  presentence report at this point?
 9
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, Your Honor.
10
             THE COURT: And my guess is the guideline calculation
   calls for a pretty lengthy sentence, doesn't it?
11
12
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
13
             THE COURT: And that's got you second guessing
   whether or not you should have taken the plea, is that correct?
14
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
15
16
             THE COURT:
                         But you don't know yet how this case is
17
   going to work out, do you?
18
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             No.
19
             THE COURT:
                         And it's very hard to trust a lawyer when
   there is so much uncertainty, correct?
20
21
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: But would you agree with me that maybe
22
   the better path is to continue to trust in Mr. Placke's
23
  judgment in this case since he understands and has been through
24
25
   this type of case before?
```

1 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 2 THE COURT: All right. Listen to me. Why in the world would you, who have never been through something like 3 this before, make a decision that runs against what somebody 5 who is very well-experienced in this has told you? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I believe I have enough 7 evidence to challenge the case and that with the letters I've sent to the FBI, the letters I've sent to the DOJ, I have 9 worked hard in trying to challenge the evidence that the Government has so that I would be able to have enough evidence with an investigation to overturn -- overturn the evidence that 12 the prosecution has and prove my innocence. 13 THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Hill? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Pretty much I submit these papers to the Court. 15 16 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Placke, do you want me to 17 take a look at the papers? 18 MR. PLACKE: Your Honor, I haven't seen the most 19 recent --20 THE COURT: Why don't you look at them first. 21 MR. PLACKE: If I may. THE COURT: You may. Let's take about a 10-minute 22 recess and let Mr. Placke look at those papers. 23 Then we'll come back. Mr. Matkins, you may -- I don't know how much you 24 25 know about this case. I believe, if I remember correctly, the

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

```
Government agreed that Mr. Hill could plead to the zero to 10,
 2
   is that right?
 3
             MR. PLACKE: That's correct, Your Honor.
                         Zero to 10 possession offense.
 4
             THE COURT:
                                                          I think
   that no matter what the guideline range may show, I don't
 5
 6
  believe your office is pushing for a lengthy active -- any type
                        I may have misread what I was hearing, but
 7
   of active sentence.
  at this point I'd be -- assuming all those facts to be the
 9
   case, I would be inclined to not substitute counsel here but
   let this case move forward to what appeared to me to have been
   the intended resolution. I may be speaking out of turn, but I
11
12
   certainly recall there being signals of that type.
                                                        So if you
   need to talk to Mr. Ramaswamy, we'll be at ease for 10 minutes.
13
             (At 11:18 a.m., break taken.)
14
             (At 11:31 a.m., break concluded.)
15
                         All right. Mr. Placke, do you want me to
16
             THE COURT:
17
   take a look at that, or what's your position?
18
             MR. PLACKE: Your Honor, I first appreciate the
   chance to review it. I don't believe there's anything new that
19
   the Court hasn't already heard in one form or another that
20
  would be adverse to Mr. Hill. By and large, it's simply
21
   comments about me, and I certainly don't want to interfere with
22
  his ability to communicate to the Court about that.
23
                                                         I checked
  with Mr. Hill during the recess, and he does want the Court to
25
            Therefore, I prefer to just provide it to the Court.
   see it.
```

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

THE COURT: All right. If you'll hand it up, I'll take a look at that.

(Court reviewing documents.)

THE COURT: I reviewed Mr. Hill's letter, and at this point I have not seen the presentence report. I have, however, seen the evaluations and the factual basis and a number of letters. Mr. Hill, if nothing else, is a prolific letter writer. Let me see. I said I've seen the factual basis. I've seen some facts somewhere, but was there one filed in this case, or was it withheld?

MR. PLACKE: There was a factual basis, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, as I alluded to earlier, the Government in the vast majority of these possession of child pornography cases these days where file sharing is involved has been requiring a plea to the 5 to 20 offense rather than a zero to 10. So there is -- in light of the Government's extension of a plea to the zero to 10 offense, the zero to 10 possession offense rather than the 5 to 20 offense, that certainly at least indicates to some degree the Government's evaluation of the seriousness of the offense. I think for whatever reason there was some discussion at the Rule 11 colloquy about this particular case as well in terms of the Government's position. Yes, sir, Mr. Matkins?

MR. MATKINS: I received an email from Mr. Ramaswamy yesterday regarding this matter, and I came to the same

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014

conclusion that the Court came to or recalls from the change of plea previously as to the Government's position.

Mr. Hill, I'm sure, confronted with a guideline calculation that's probably -- if it's not up -- I haven't seen the presentence report, but the majority of these types of cases end up with an 84-, 97-, or even higher than 120-month guideline calculation, and that would have difficult -- could have an extreme effect on anyone, and it's certainly understandable the effect that seeing that presentence report would have on Mr. Hill in light of various mental and emotional conditions that he has described here today, much of that confirmed by various evaluations. I can understand where there would be some turmoil and concern about revisiting decisions with respect to plea or trial that had already been made.

Now, ultimately, I will say, I think to be clear, that it wouldn't make any difference to me in any way, shape, form, or fashion what the extended plea was if a defendant came forward with a proffer of substantial evidence of innocence such that the case should be set aside. Unfortunately, in this case, Mr. Hill's current complaints echo a lot of what Mr. Hill was representing originally in this case, and ultimately here we're not -- in this type of possession of child pornography case, the investigations are not extremely complicated.

So ultimately, it seems to me, number one,

Mr. Hill -- I am impressed with Mr. Hill's candor. He begrudgingly, but candidly, admitted that he and Mr. Placke were still communicating, and he candidly admitted that, in large part, he relied on pressure from his family, which is -- a defendant is free to rely on whatever advice they choose to rely on in terms of accepting a plea. But in fairness to Mr. Hill, I don't think there's any question but that Mr. Placke recommended this course as well as evidenced from the responses given during the Rule 11 colloquy.

I simply don't find Mr. Hill's current allegations to rise anywhere near a level expressing ineffective assistance of counsel or actual innocence or any other matter that would necessitate allowing -- substituting counsel and allowing Mr. Hill to -- and/or allowing Mr. Hill to withdraw his plea and proceed to trial in this case. These letters, like a number of other letters that Mr. Hill has written, claim to have substantial evidence, but ultimately present nothing more than a series of conclusory allegations unsupported by any evidence with respect to his innocence of these particular charges.

So, ultimately, I conclude that while there is at present some disagreement between Mr. Hill and Mr. Placke as to how this case should proceed that there is still communication between the parties, Mr. Placke is still -- even under very difficult circumstances has Mr. Hill's best interest in mind in

pursuing this matter, and ultimately it seems to me the best course is to proceed with this case as is and deny Mr. Hill's request for substitution of counsel.

And to put it all in complete perspective at this point, Mr. Hill's statements in his letters run completely contrary to what would ordinarily be required for an individual defendant to receive acceptance of responsibility following the entry of a guilty plea and an acknowledgment of guilt at a Rule 11 colloquy. However, I have seen enough of Mr. Hill's letters -- I think, unless I'm mistaken, there have been two evaluations. Was Mr. Hill originally sent to Butner for an evaluation?

MR. PLACKE: Your Honor, this spring he was evaluated at Butner with respect to competency and mental responsibility at the time of the offense. More recently, he was evaluated as part of the presentence process by Dr. Hirsch. There is concurrence on the three diagnoses that have been discussed here today. Dr. Hirsch did identify and make one additional diagnosis that's probably particularly relevant, delusional disorder, persecutory type, and that's discussed in his report as well as in the position paper filed.

THE COURT: Those diagnoses collectively also give this Court substantial doubt with respect to the -- I'm not sure exactly what word to use. It may very well be that Mr. Hill genuinely believes some of what -- some or all of what

he's saying. I don't know the answer to that.

But in terms of the veracity of these allegations with respect to actual innocence, I have substantial doubt. Quite frankly, the statements, the letters, and other things are entirely consistent with the disorders that -- or the issues that have been identified by the -- through the evaluations, and, quite honestly at this point, I don't find anything here that ultimately causes -- I don't even find that these allegations, in light of all the circumstances, rise to the level where I would take -- where I would at this point take away acceptance of responsibility from Mr. Hill, just to be completely fair and candid.

It's a very difficult situation that's been presented. I understand completely Mr. Hill's concern about his future in light of what I believe would have been the presentence report guideline calculation, maybe even properly calculated, but without regard to departure or variance issues that will be presented at the time of sentencing in light of all these evaluations.

So, Mr. Placke and Mr. Matkins, unless there is some -- something that I have said that you disagree with or wish to be heard further on, that will be -- that's my conclusion and will ultimately be my ruling here.

Mr. Placke, do you wish to be heard further at this point?

MR. PLACKE: No, Your Honor. I would simply add that if those diagnoses were not present, my position would probably be different.

THE COURT: As would mine.

MR. PLACKE: But as the Court has alluded to and more explicitly stated, we, the criminal justice system, have to be able to move forward in cases like this, and the individuals involved, counsel, whoever, have to be able to move forward or else it's ultimately to the detriment, I believe, of the individual.

THE COURT: I agree. I haven't made a decision with respect to a plea. I can completely understand being concerned about that decision and these various conditions leading to attacks or efforts to change that decision, but at this point I think -- number one, I don't think there's grounds to go back and revisit the decision. Number two, I think it's, to a large degree, understandable.

Mr. Matkins, you would be the one ultimately defending what I do here today. Do you wish to be heard further on this?

MR. MATKINS: No, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hill, let me ask you to stand up, please, sir. I know that you probably disagree with some or all of what I have said, and you're entitled to disagree with me. On the other hand, I have to make certain

```
decisions about -- based on the evidence that's been presented,
   and I make those decisions, and the case continues to move
 2
   forward. At this point I am denying your motion for new
 3
   counsel for the reasons that I have described.
   understand that?
 5
 6
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
 7
             THE COURT:
                         And that means that Mr. Placke will
   continue to represent you in this case. There is -- when's
 8
 9
   this case set for sentencing, Mr. Placke? It's like in two or
10
   three weeks maybe?
                          Later this month, Your Honor.
11
             MR. PLACKE:
12
   for -- I can't remember if it's September 26 or September 30.
                           I believe it's the 30th, Your Honor.
13
             MR. MATKINS:
14
             MR. PLACKE:
                          The 30th.
             THE COURT:
                         Mr. Placke -- I am directing Mr. Placke
15
16
  to proceed ahead with his representation of you, Mr. Hill, in
17
   terms of the presentence report and the various other matters
18
   to be presented. I'm going to ask -- since I've denied the
19
  motion, I'm going to ask that you continue to work with
   Mr. Placke even though you may disagree with the things that he
   is doing on your behalf to finish this case up.
21
  understand that?
22
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
24
             THE COURT: All right. I'm going to tell you that
25
   you have been very respectful toward me in the way you have
```

addressed this Court and the way you have expressed the matters
that you are concerned about, and I appreciate that. I want
you to leave here with some understanding that I wasn't always
a judge. I used to do similar cases. I'm sure I didn't handle
them nearly as well, but I used to handle cases like

Mr. Placke, criminal defense work, and I've been there when
there have been problems when the presentence report was
disclosed and things looked very bleak in terms of how the case
was going to work out.

You are entitled to your lawyer -- to the best advice your lawyer can possibly give you, you're entitled to a lawyer who represents your interests to the best of his ability, and you are entitled to a lawyer who advocates on your behalf in the courtroom. The one thing you're not entitled to is a lawyer who simply tells you what you want to hear just to make you feel better or advises you to do something simply because it's the easiest way to make you happy. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Placke at this point has not presented anything to me to suggest that Mr. Placke has failed to discharge his duties to you or that he has given bad advice to the extent that it rises to the level of ineffective assistance of counsel. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

```
I'm going to ask you to trust in
 1
             THE COURT:
  Mr. Placke just a little bit longer, and let's see how this
 2
   case works out. All right?
 3
             THE DEFENDANT: All right.
 4
                         All right. Anything further, Mr. Placke?
 5
             THE COURT:
 6
             MR. PLACKE: Just for the record, Your Honor, the
 7
   second half of the motion was for an extension of the pleading
 8
   deadline. Since there's not going to be new counsel, I think
 9
   that's moot.
                 I filed our position paper.
10
             THE COURT:
                         There was a position paper.
                                                       All right.
  I'm going to ask Ms. Welch to note upon the docket that the
11
12
   motion to withdraw is denied for the reasons stated in the
   record; and as a result of the denial of the motion, the Court
13
  finds the motion for extension of time to file sentencing
  pleadings is moot and, therefore, denied.
15
16
             Anything further, Mr. Matkins?
17
             MR. MATKINS: No, sir, Your Honor.
18
             THE COURT:
                         Mr. Placke?
19
             MR. PLACKE:
                         No, Your Honor.
                                           There is something on a
   completely different matter, though, if the Court has a moment
20
   after we've adjourned.
21
             THE COURT: All right. I'll do that.
                                                     If there's
22
23
   nothing further, we'll stand in recess until 2:00.
              (At 11:50 a.m., proceedings concluded.)
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Joseph B. Armstrong, RMR, FCRR Date: 06/24/2015 United States Court Reporter 324 W. Market Street Greensboro, NC 27401

US v. Hill - Motion - September 3, 2014